

"IN MODERATION PLACING ALL MY GLORY, WHILE TORIES CALL MR WHIG—AND WHIGS A TORY."

Mr. JOHN WALTON,
Innkeeper, Burrows;
Or of
Mr. J. G. RAPHAEL,
Lower George-street, Sydney
May 11.
N. B. To prevent disappointment immediate application is necessary. * All communications

[illegible]

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 1846.

Late English News.

THE AMERICAN PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

(From Bell's Weekly Messenger, December 27.)

This important document, which has been looked for with great anxiety, reached London on Monday afternoon by the ship *Arcturion*. The Message is one of unusual length, and would, if printed in full, occupy about two pages of our paper. But we must not forget that this is Christmas, and to think of inflicting such a task upon our readers as that of wading through such a mass of political matter, would be unpardonable. A brief summary must therefore suffice.

The Message commences with a congratulatory notice of the general prosperity of the Union, and gratefully mentions the condition of affairs to the President of the Divine Being. The Message then proceeds to notice the

annexation of Texas. The terms of the annexation having been accepted by the people of Texas, the President remarks that the passage of an act by Congress to admit the state of Texas into the Union upon an equal footing with the original states.

The dispute with Mexico, arising out of the annexation of Texas, is discussed at length, and closes with the gratifying announcement that the diplomatic relations of the United States with Mexico have been renewed, thus putting an end to all fear of war.

THE OREGON QUESTION. As part of the Message relating to the Oregon question is the grand point of dispute, the final decision upon which by the two governments will either preserve our present pacific relations with America, or involve us in war with that country, we deem it right to give Mr. Polk's own words.

"My attention was early directed to the negotiation, which, on the 4th of March last, I found pending at Washington between the United States and Great Britain, on the subject of the Oregon territory. Three several attempts had been previously made to settle the question in dispute between the two countries, by negotiation, upon the principle of compromise; but each had proved unsuccessful.

"These negotiations took place at London, in the years 1818, 1824, and 1829, the two first under the administration of Mr. Monroe, and the last under that of Mr. Adams. The negotiation of 1818 failed to accomplish its object, having resulted in the convention of the 24th of October in that year. By the said article of that convention it was agreed that any country that may be claimed by either party on the north-west coast of America, westward of the Stony Mountains, shall, together with its harbours, bays, and creeks, and the navigation of all rivers within the same, be free and open for the term of ten years from the date of the signature of the present convention, to the vessels, citizens, and subjects of the two powers; it being well understood that this agreement is not to be construed to the prejudice of any claim which either of the two high contracting parties may have to any part of the said country, nor shall it be taken to affect the claims of any other power or state to any part of the said country; the only object of the high contracting parties in that regard being to prevent disputes and difficulties among themselves."

"The negotiation of 1824 was productive of no result, and the convention of 1829 was left unchanged.

"The negotiation of 1826, having also failed to effect an adjustment by compromise, resulted in the convention of August 6th, 1827, by which it was agreed to continue in force, for an indefinite period, the provisions of the third article of the convention of the 20th of October, 1818; and it was further provided, that it shall be competent, however, to either of the contracting parties, in case either should think fit, at any time after the 20th of October, 1828, on giving due notice of 12 months to the other contracting party, to annul and abrogate this convention; and it shall, in such case, be accordingly annulled and abrogated after the expiration of the said term of notice."

"In the attempts to adjust the controversy, the parallel of the 49th degree of north latitude has been offered by the United States to Great Britain, and in those of 1818 and 1826, with a further concession of the free navigation of the Columbia River south of that latitude. The parallel of the 49th degree, from the Rocky Mountains to the intersection with the north-western branch of the Columbia, and thence down the channel of that river to the sea, had been offered by Great Britain, with an addition of a small detached territory north of the Columbia. Each of these propositions had been rejected by the other party respectively.

"In October, 1843, the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States in London was authorized to make a similar offer to those made in 1818, and 1826. Thus stood the question when the negotiation was finally afterwards transferred to Washington, and, on the 23rd of August, 1844, the formally opened under the direction of my immediate predecessor. Like all the previous negotiations, it was based upon the principle of 'compromise,' and the avowed purpose of the parties was to settle the respective claims of the two countries to the Oregon territory, with the view to establish a permanent boundary between them westward of the Rocky Mountains in the Pacific Ocean."

"Accordingly, on the 26th of August, 1844, the British plenipotentiary offered to divide the Oregon territory by the 49th parallel of north latitude, from the Rocky Mountains to the point of its intersection with the north-eastern branch of the Columbia River, and thence down that river to the sea, leaving the free navigation of the river to be enjoyed in common by both parties—the country south of this line to belong to the United States, and the north of it to Great Britain. At the same time, he proposed, in addition, to divide the United States a detached ter-

ritory, north of the Columbia, extending along the Pacific and the Straits of Fuca, from Bulfinch's Harbour, inclusive, to Hood's Canal, and to make free to the United States any port or ports south of latitude 49 degrees, which they might desire, either on the main land or on Quadra or Vancouver's Island. With the exception of the free ports this was the same offer which had been made by the British and rejected by the American government in the negotiation of 1826. This proposition was properly rejected by the American plenipotentiary on the day it was submitted. This was the only proposition of compromise offered by the British plenipotentiary requested that a proposal should be made by the United States for an equitable adjustment of the question."

"When I came into office, I found this to be the state of the negotiation. Though entertaining the settled conviction that the British pretensions of title could not be maintained to any portion of the Oregon territory upon any principle of public law recognised by nations, yet, in deference to what had been done by my predecessors, and especially in consideration that propositions of compromise had been thrice made by two preceding administrations, to adjust the question on the parallel of 49 degrees, and in two of them yielding to Great Britain the free navigation of the Columbia, and that the pending negotiation had been commenced on the basis of compromise, I deemed it to be my duty not abruptly to break it off."

"In consideration too, that under the conventions of 1818 and 1827, the citizens and subjects of the two powers held a joint occupancy of the country, I was induced to make another effort to settle this long-pending controversy in the spirit of moderation which had given birth to the renewed discussion. A proposition was accordingly made, which was rejected by the British Plenipotentiary, who, without submitting any other proposition, suffered the negotiation on his part to drop, expressing his trust that the United States would offer what he saw fit to call 'some further proposal for the settlement of the Oregon question more consistent with fairness and equity, and with the reasonable expectations of the British government.' The proposition thus offered and rejected repeated the offer of the parallel of 49 degrees of north latitude, which had been made by two preceding administrations, but without proposing to surrender to Great Britain, as they had done, the free navigation of the Columbia River. The right of any foreign power to the free navigation of any of our rivers, through the heart of our country, was one which I was unwilling to concede. It also embraced a provision to make free to Great Britain any port or ports on the Cape of Quadra and Vancouver's Island, south of this parallel. Had this been a new question, coming under discussion for the first time, this proposition would not have been made. The extraordinary and wholly inadmissible demands of the British Government, and the rejection of the proposition made in deference alone to what had been done by my predecessors, and the implied obligation which their acts seemed to impose, afford satisfactory evidence that no compromise which the United States ought to accept can be effected. With this conviction the proposition of compromise which had been made and rejected was by my direction subsequently withdrawn, and our title to the whole Oregon territory asserted, and, as is believed, maintained by irrefragable facts and arguments."

"The civilized world will see in these proceedings a spirit of liberal concession on the part of the United States, and this government will be relieved from all responsibility which may follow the failure to settle the controversy."

"All attempts at compromise having failed, it becomes the duty of Congress to consider what measures it may be proper to adopt for the security and protection of our citizens now inhabiting or who may hereafter inhabit Oregon, and for the maintenance of our just title to that territory. In adopting measures for this purpose care should be taken that nothing be done to violate the stipulations of the convention of 1827, which is still in force. The faith of treaties, in their letter and spirit, has ever been, and I trust will ever be, scrupulously observed by the United States. Under that convention a year's notice is required to be given by either party to the other, before the joint occupancy shall terminate, and before either can rightfully assert or exercise exclusive jurisdiction over any portion of the territory. This notice it would, in my judgment, be proper to give; and I recommend that provisions be made by law for giving it accordingly, and terminating, in this manner, the convention of the 6th August, 1827."

"It will become proper for Congress to determine what legislation they can, in the mean time adopt, without violating this convention. Beyond all question, the protection of our laws and our jurisdiction, civil and criminal, ought to be immediately extended over our citizens in Oregon. They have had just cause to complain of our long neglect in this particular, and have, in consequence, been compelled, for their own security and protection, to establish a provisional government for themselves. Strong in their allegiance, and ardent in their attachment to the United States, they have been thus cast upon their own resources. They are anxious that our laws should be extended over them; and I recommend that this be done by Congress with as little delay as possible, in the full extent to which the British Parliament have proceeded in regard to British subjects in that territory, by their act of July 2, 1821, for regulating the fur trade, and establishing a criminal and civil jurisdiction within certain parts of North America. By this act Great Britain extended her laws and jurisdiction, civil and criminal, over her subjects, engaged in the fur trade in that territory. By it, the courts of the province of Upper Canada were empowered to take cognizance of causes civil and criminal. Justices of the peace, and other judicial officers, were authorised to be appointed in Oregon, with power to execute all process issuing from the courts of

that province, and to sit and hold courts of record for the trial of criminal offences and misdemeanors, not made the subject of capital punishment, and also of civil cases, where the cause of action shall not exceed in value the amount or sum of £200."

"Subsequent to the date of this act of parliament, a grant was made from the 'British Crown' to the Hudson's Bay Company, of the exclusive trade with the Indian tribes in the Oregon territory, subject to a reservation that it shall not operate to the exclusion of the subjects of any foreign states who, under or by force of any convention for the time being, between us and such foreign states respectively, may be entitled to, and shall be engaged in, the said trade."

"It is much to be regretted, that, while under this act the British subjects have enjoyed the protection of British laws and British judicial tribunals throughout the whole of Oregon, the American citizens in the same territory have enjoyed no such protection from their government. At the same time, the result illustrates the character of our people and their institutions. In spite of this neglect they have multiplied, and their number is rapidly increasing in that territory. They have made no appeal to arms, but have peacefully fortified themselves in their new homes, by the adoption of republican institutions for themselves, furnishing another example of the truth that self-government is inherent in the American breast, and must prevail. It is due to them that they should be embraced and protected by our laws."

"It is deemed important that our laws regulating trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes east of the Rocky Mountains should be extended to such tribes as dwell beyond them. The increasing emigration to Oregon, and the care and protection which is due from the government to its citizens in that distant region, make it our duty, as it is our interest, to cultivate amicable relations with the Indian tribes of that territory. For this purpose, I recommend that provision be made for establishing an Indian agency, and such sub-agencies as may be deemed necessary beyond the Rocky Mountains. For the protection of emigrants whilst on their way to Oregon, against the attacks of the Indian tribes occupying the country through which they pass, I recommend that a suitable number of stockades and blockhouse forts be erected along the usual route between our frontier settlements on the Missouri and the Rocky Mountains, and that an adequate force of mounted riflemen be raised to guard and protect them on their journey. The immediate adoption of these recommendations by Congress will not violate the provisions of the existing treaty. It will be doing nothing more for American citizens than British laws have long since done for British subjects in the same territory. It requires several months to perform the voyage by sea from the Atlantic States to Oregon; and although we have a large number of whale ships in the Pacific, few of them afford an opportunity of interchanging intelligence, without delay, between our settlements in that distant region and the United States. An overland mail is believed to be entirely practicable, and the importance of establishing such a mail, at least once a month, is submitted to the favourable consideration of Congress."

"It is submitted to the wisdom of Congress to determine whether, at their present session, and until after the expiration of the year's notice, any other measures may be adopted, consistently with the convention of 1827, for the security of our rights, and the government and protection of our citizens in Oregon. That it will ultimately be wise and proper to make liberal grants of land to the patriotic pioneers, who, amidst privations and dangers, lead the way through savage tribes inhabiting the vast wilderness intervening between our frontier settlements and Oregon, and who cultivate, and are ever ready to defend the soil, I am fully satisfied. To doubt whether they will obtain such grants as soon as the convention between the United States and Great Britain shall have ceased to exist would be to doubt the justice of Congress; but, pending the year's notice, it is worthy of consideration whether a stipulation to this effect may be made, consistently with the spirit of that convention."

"The recommendations which I have made as to the best manner of securing our rights in Oregon are submitted to Congress with great deference. Should they, in their wisdom, devise any other mode better calculated to accomplish the same object, it shall meet with my hearty concurrence. At the end of the year's notice, should Congress think it proper to make provision for giving that notice, we shall have reached a period when the national rights of Oregon must either be abandoned or firmly maintained. That they cannot be abandoned without a sacrifice of both national honour and interest is too clear to admit of doubt."

"Oregon is a part of the North American continent, to which it is confidently affirmed the title of the United States is the best now in existence. For the grounds on which that title rests I refer you to the correspondence of the late and present Secretary of State with the British plenipotentiary during the negotiation. The British proposition of compromise, which would make the Columbia the line south of forty-nine degrees, with a trifling addition of detached territory to the United States north of that river, and would leave on the British side two-thirds of the whole Oregon territory, including the free navigation of the Columbia and all the valuable harbours on the Pacific, can never, for a moment, be entertained by the United States, without an abandonment of their just and clear territorial rights, their own self-respect, and the national honour. For the information of Congress I communicate herewith the correspondence which took place between the governments during the late negotiation."

"The rapid extension of our settlements over our territories heretofore unoccupied, the addition of new states to our confederacy, the expansion of free principles, and our rising greatness as a

nation, are attracting the attention of the powers of Europe; and lately the doctrine has been broached in some of them of a balance of power on this continent, to check our advancement. The United States, sincerely desirous of preserving relations of good understanding with all nations, cannot in silence permit any European interference on the North American continent; and should any such interference be attempted, will be ready to resist it at any and all hazards."

"It is well known to the American people and to all nations that this government has never interfered with the relations subsisting between other governments. We have never made ourselves parties to their wars or their alliances; we have not sought their territories by conquest; we have not mingled with parties in their domestic struggles; and believing our own form of government to be the best, we have never attempted to propagate it by intrigues, by diplomacy, or by force. We may claim on this continent a like exemption from European interference. The nations of America are equally sovereign and independent with those of Europe. They possess the same rights, independent of all foreign interposition, to make war, conclude peace, and to regulate their internal affairs. The people of the United States cannot, therefore, view with indifference attempts of European powers to interfere with the independent action of the nations on this continent. The American system of government is entirely different from that of Europe. Jealousy amongst the different Sovereigns of Europe, lest any one of them might become too powerful for the rest, has caused them anxiously to desire the 'balance of power.' It cannot be permitted to have application on the North American continent, and especially to the United States. We must ever maintain the principle that the people of this continent alone have a right to decide their own destiny. Should any portion of them, constituting an independent state, propose to unite themselves with our confederacy, this will be a question for them and us to determine, without any foreign interposition. We can never consent that European powers shall interfere to prevent such a union, because it might disturb the 'balance of power' which they may desire to maintain upon this continent."

"Near a quarter of a century ago the principle was distinctly announced to the world, in the annual message of one of my predecessors, that 'the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonisation by any European power.' This principle will apply with greatly increased force should any European power attempt to establish a new colony in North America. In the existing circumstance of the world, the present is deemed a proper occasion to reiterate and re-affirm the principle affirmed by Mr. Monroe, and to state my cordial concurrence in its wisdom and sound policy. The re-assertion of this principle, especially in reference to North America, is at this day but the promulgation of a policy which no European power should cherish the disposition to resist. Existing rights of every European nation should be respected; but it is due alike to our safety and our interests, that the efficient protection of our laws should be extended over our whole territorial limits, and that it should be distinctly announced to the world as our settled policy, that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established on any part of the North American continent."

"Some details respecting disputed questions with Prussia and commercial engagements with Spain, Holland, and China follow. The state of the Treasury is then touched upon in congratulatory language."

THE TARIFF. This is another part of the Message, second only in interest to that relating to Oregon. In addressing himself to this subject Mr. Polk says:—

"The attention of Congress is invited to the importance of making suitable modifications and reductions of the rates of duty imposed by our present tariff laws. The object of imposing duties on imports should be to raise revenue to pay the necessary expenses of government. Congress may, undoubtedly, in the exercise of a sound discretion, discriminate in arranging the rates of duty on different articles, but the discriminations should be within the revenue standard, and be made within the view to raise money for the support of government."

"It becomes important to understand distinctly what is meant by a revenue standard, the maximum of which should not be exceeded in the rates of duty imposed. Experience proves, that duties may be laid so high as to diminish or prohibit altogether the importation of any given article, and thereby lessen or destroy the revenues, which, at lower rates, would be derived from its importation. If Congress levy a duty for revenue, of one per cent. on a given article, it will produce a given amount of money to the Treasury, and will incidentally and necessarily afford protection or advantage to the amount of one per cent. to the home manufacturer of a similar or like article over the importer. If the duty be raised to 10 per cent., it will produce a greater amount of money, and afford greater protection. If it be still raised to 20, or 25, or 30 per cent., and if, as it is raised, the revenue derived from it is found to be increased, the protection or advantage will also be increased; but if it be raised to 31 per cent., and it is found that the revenue produced at that rate is less than 30 per cent., it ceases to be a revenue duty. The precise point in the ascending scale of duties at which it is ascertained from experience that the revenue is greatest, is the maximum rate of duty which can be laid for the bona fide purpose of collecting money for the support of government. To raise the duties higher than that point, and thereby diminish the amount collected, is to levy them for protection merely, and not for revenue. As long, then, as Congress may gradually increase

the rate of duty, on a given article and the revenue is increased by such increase of duty they are within the revenue standard. When they go beyond that point, and, as they increase the duties, the revenue is diminished or destroyed, the act ceases to have for its object the raising of money to support Government, but is for protection merely."

"It does not follow that Congress should levy the highest duty on all articles of import which they will bear within the revenue standard, for such rates would probably produce a much larger amount than the economical administration of the government would require. Nor does it follow that the duties on all articles should be at the same, on a horizontal rate. Some articles will bear a much higher revenue duty than others. Below the maximum of the revenue standard Congress may and ought to discriminate in the rates imposed, taking care so to adjust them on different articles as to produce in the aggregate the amount which, when added to the proceeds of sales of public lands, may be needed to pay the economical expenses of the government."

"In levying a tariff of duties Congress exercises the taxing power, and for purposes of revenue may select the objects of taxation. They may exempt certain articles altogether, and permit their importation free of duty. On others they may impose low duties. In these classes should be embraced such articles of necessity as are in general use, and especially such as are consumed by the labourer and the poor, as well as by the wealthy citizen. Care should be taken that all the great interests of the country, including manufactures, agriculture, commerce, navigation, and the mechanic arts, should, as far as may be practicable, derive equal advantages from the incidental protection which a just system of revenue duties may afford. Taxation, direct, or indirect, is a burden, and it should be so imposed as to operate as equally as may be on all classes, in the proportion of their ability to bear it. To make the taxing power an actual benefit to one class, necessarily increases the burden of the others beyond their proportion, and would be manifestly unjust. The terms 'protection to domestic industry,' are of popular import; but they should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer or planter who toils yearly in his fields is engaged in a 'domestic industry,' and is as much entitled to have his labour 'protected' as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator, or the mechanic, who are engaged also in a 'domestic industry' in their different pursuits. The joint labours of all these classes constitute the aggregate of the 'domestic industry' of the nation, and they are equally entitled to the nation's 'protection.' No one of them can justly claim to be the exclusive recipients of 'protection' which can only be afforded by increasing burdens on the 'domestic industry' of the others."

"If these views be correct, it remains to inquire how far the Tariff Act of 1842 is consistent with them. That many of the provisions of that Act are in violation of all must concede. The rates of duty imposed by it on some articles are prohibitory, and on others as high as to greatly diminish imports, and to produce a less amount of revenue than would be derived from lower rates. They operate as 'protection merely,' to one branch of 'domestic industry,' by taxing other branches."

"By the introduction of minimums, or assumed and false values, and by the imposition of specific duties, the injustice and inequality of the act of 1842, in its practical operations on different classes and pursuits, are seen and felt. Many of the operative duties imposed by it under the operations of these principles range from 1 per cent. to more than 200 per cent. They are prohibitory on some articles, and partially so on others, and bear most heavily on articles of common necessity, and but lightly on articles of luxury. It is so framed that much the greatest burden which it imposes is thrown on labour and the poorer classes, who are least able to bear it, while it protects capital and exempts the rich from paying their just proportion of the taxation required for the support of government."

"While it protects the capital of the wealthy manufacturer, and increases his profits, it does not benefit the operatives or labourers in his employment, whose wages have not been increased by it. Articles of prime necessity, or of coarse quality and low price, used by the masses of the people, are, in many instances, subjected to heavy taxes, while articles of finer quality and higher price, or of luxury, which can be used only by the opulent, are lightly taxed. It imposes heavy and unjust burdens on the farmer, the planter, the commercial man, and those of all other pursuits, except the capitalist who has made his investments in manufactures. All the great interests of the country are not, as nearly as may be practicable, equally protected by it."

"In recommending to Congress a reduction of the present rates of duty, and a revision and modification of the act of 1842, I am far from entertaining opinions unfriendly to the manufacturers. On the contrary, I desire to see them prosperous, as far as they can be so, without imposing unequal burdens on other interests. The advantage, under any system of indirect taxation, even within the revenue standard, must be in favour of the manufacturing interests; and of this no other interests will complain."

"I recommend to Congress the abolition of the minimum principle, or assumed, arbitrary, and false value, and of specific duties, and the substitution in their place of ad valorem duties, as the fairest and most equitable indirect tax which can be imposed. By the ad valorem principle, all articles are taxed according to their cost or value, and those which are of inferior quality, or of small cost, bear only the just proportion of the tax with those which are of superior quality or greater cost. The articles consumed by all are taxed at the same rate. A system of ad valorem revenue duties, with proper discriminations and proper guards, against frauds in collecting them, it is not doubted

will afford ample incidental advantages to the manufacturers, and enable them to derive as great profits as can be derived from any other regular business. It is believed that such a system, strictly within the revenue standard, will place the manufacturing interests on a stable footing, and ensure to their permanent advantage, while it will, as nearly as may be practicable, extend to all the great interests of the country the incidental protection which can be afforded by our revenue laws. Such a system, when once firmly established, would be permanent, and not be subject to the constant complaints, agitations, and changes, which must ever occur, when duties are not laid for revenue, but for the 'protection merely' of a favoured interest."

The remainder of the Message is occupied with subjects which bear very remotely upon European interests."

THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS. [We give the following extracts from the London papers of the 11th and 12th December, as they show the feelings and views which were excited among different parties by the unexpected announcement of the resignation of the Peel Ministry.—Eas. S. M. H.]

(From the Court Circular.) The Queen held a Court and Privy Council on Wednesday at Osborne-house, Isle of Wight. The Council was attended by His Royal Highness Prince Albert, the Duke of Buccleuch, lord privy seal; the Duke of Wellington, commander-in-chief; Sir Robert Peel, first lord of the Treasury; Sir James Graham, secretary of state for the home department; the Earl of Aberdeen, secretary of state for foreign affairs; Lord Stanley, secretary of the colonies; the Right Hon. H. Goulburn, chancellor of the exchequer; the Earl of Lincoln, chief commissioner of the woods and forests; and the Right Hon. Sidney Herbert, secretary at war. At the council Parliament was ordered to be further prorogued from Tuesday, 16th December, until Tuesday, the 30th December. Mr. C. Greville was the clerk of the council in waiting. The Earl of Warwick was the lord in waiting. Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of Buccleuch, Lords Aberdeen, Stanley, and Lincoln, Sir James Graham, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Sidney Herbert, travelled from town to attend the council by a special train on the South Western Railway. At Basingstoke the Duke of Wellington joined his colleagues. From Southampton the party was conveyed in the *Fairy* steam yacht to Cowes, arriving at Osborne-house at five minutes past twelve o'clock. After the council the Cabinet Ministers left Osborne-house, together with the Bishop of Norwich, the Bishop of Oxford, and Mr. C. Greville, and were conveyed in the *Fairy* steam yacht to Southampton, where a special train was in readiness on the South Western Railway. The party proceeded to Basingstoke, where the Duke of Wellington alighted from the train; the other noblemen and gentlemen went to town, accomplishing the distance in one hour and five minutes.

(From the Herald of Thursday.) Sir Robert Peel's Government is at an end. All the Members of the Cabinet yesterday tendered their resignation, which her Majesty was pleased to accept. It will be easily believed that we regret this determination of her Majesty's advisers; but we should much more regret their unanimous determination to sacrifice the industry of the country by stripping it of all protection. The important fact now announced proves how completely wrong the *Times* was when it stated that the Government had decided upon proposing to Parliament, as a Cabinet measure, the repeal of the corn-laws.

(From the Herald of Friday.) We stated yesterday that the whole Cabinet had resigned. Such is the fact; the whole of the Conservative Cabinet goes out together, and, we have no doubt, will adhere to the Conservative party. Whatever Sir Robert Peel's opinion upon the subject of the corn-laws, the country may be well assured that he never did propose, and in office or out of office never will either propose or support any change in the corn-laws, unaccompanied by what he believes to be full compensation to the landed interest through all its gradations. Whence that full compensation is to be obtained we are utterly at a loss to conjecture, but it is no more than an act of justice to the late Premier, as we suppose we may call him now, to repeat it, that he never did propose, as the infamous fabrication of the *Times* asserted, an unqualified and total repeal of the corn-laws. Now, as we firmly believe, will he ever propose or support any such measure. This is most important, because whatever difference has existed in the Cabinet has been merely a difference in degree and not in species; and therefore cannot extend to the Conservative party in either House of Parliament. Lord John Russell has been summoned by the Queen, and is now in attendance upon her Majesty as her confidential adviser.

(From the Times of Friday.) Sir Robert Peel has resigned, and Lord John Russell has been invited to form a new administration. Such is the sudden and strange event which has taken by surprise the whole political world; and such the verification, if not the fulfilment, of the intelligence which yesterday week astonished our readers. At that time another conclusion of the controversies which had evidently long harassed the Cabinet was confidently and justly expected. Sir Robert Peel had then gained over to a total repeal of the corn-laws all his colleagues except three or four, with whose co-operation, if report speak true, he might very well have dispensed. He had just won the reluctant assent of the Duke of Wellington, and his promise to propose the measure in the Lords. It had also been agreed to summon the Parliament early in January for this purpose. Our readers then possessed an exact and literal transcript of the ministerial state and intentions. We had not even omitted to notice the insignificant and doubtful exceptions to the general unanimity. Unless, indeed, it had been pos-

sible to tell, not only what was in men's minds, but also what might possibly enter into them, we are convinced that not even the Cabinet itself could have given a truer account of the state of affairs. Subsequently, however, to the date of our announcement, the Duke withdrew his assent, and joined the minority. The Premier then felt that it was not his place, or perhaps in his power, to carry the measure. On Saturday, accordingly, Sir R. Peel informed the Queen of the difficulties in which he found himself, and tendered his resignation. Her Majesty, it is said, was pleased to express a great desire to retain his services, if it could possibly be so arranged. Sir Robert Peel could suggest no alternative, and the Queen summoned Lord John Russell to her councils. On Wednesday the whole ministry resigned, and is now only holding office till Lord John Russell has selected a Government to supply its place.

(From the Chronicle of Friday.) The only facts upon which reliance can be placed with respect to the ministerial crisis are these.—At the time the story was published last week, respecting the decision of the Cabinet, the Cabinet was virtually dissolved. They had indeed come to a decision, but it is now understood it was a decision to resign. On Saturday Sir Robert Peel went to Osborne House, and communicated this event to her Majesty, and on Saturday evening a messenger was sent to Lord John Russell to Edinburgh. Her Majesty's commands were received by the noble lord on Monday morning, and he arrived in town on Wednesday evening. Yesterday morning Lord John Russell left town for Osborne House, having had an interview it is said, with Sir Robert Peel before his departure. His lordship remained at Osborne House last night, and is expected in town to-day at one o'clock. It is understood that before his departure Lord John Russell addressed communications to several of his late colleagues, only one of whom, we believe, Mr. Baring, happened to be in London. It is superfluous to say that, under these circumstances, all rumours as to 'ministerial arrangements,' may be considered as altogether unfounded.

(From the Globe of Friday.) Lord John Russell returned to town from Osborne House this day at two o'clock. It is understood that the noble lord is entrusted with full powers to form an administration. On his lordship's arrival at his residence in Chesham-place, Belgrave-square, he was joined by Lord Cottenham, Lord Palmerston, and one or two others of the Liberal party, who remained in consultation for a considerable time. Of the precise result of Lord John Russell's visit to Osborne House, little or nothing has yet transpired. Various rumours are of course afloat; but knowing that upon those points on which our readers are most desirous of being informed, nothing can at present be known, we refrain from giving them currency. Upon one point we can, however, speak with confidence. We have reasons to believe that, notwithstanding the manifest difficulties which a single glance assured him must inevitably beset his path, Lord J. Russell obeyed the summons of her Majesty, with a determination to allow no considerations of a merely party nature to interfere with or limit the tender of his services to her Majesty and the country at the present juncture. Whatever obstacles are now interposed in the way of a final settlement of the corn-law question must come from his opponents. If the House of Lords should, at the instigation of any portion of the late Cabinet, place itself in opposition to the course deemed advisable by Lord John and those who may be prepared to act with him, the responsibility will be cast without reserve upon the right shoulders. This will of course result in a direct appeal to the state of the country; of the result of which, we can, in the present state of affairs, have no doubt. The circumstances under which the Peel Cabinet has been broken up—the state, present and prospective of the country—also a proper consideration of the personal tranquility of the Sovereign—conduce to urge the necessity of a speedy release from the state of uncertainty in which the late ministry has left public affairs.

(From the Sun of Friday.) Lord John Russell has arrived in town. Lord Palmerston has arrived, and several other members of Lord Melbourne's Ministry were also expected in the course of the day, to consult relative to the new administration. Lord John Russell has been actively engaged since his arrival in town this afternoon, in the arrangements which the formation of his Ministry render necessary. Lord Cottenham had an interview with Lord John Russell after he arrived. Sir Dennis Le Marchant, Secretary to the Treasury when the Melbourne administration went out of office, has been in constant communication with Lord John this afternoon. He is acting as confidential adviser to the new Premier. The opinion gains ground that no dissolution will take place until Lord John finds obstruction to his measures in the Commons, in which case an immediate dissolution will follow. Brokers and the Reform Club are all alive, and the mustering of Liberal members in London is already great, whilst the Carlton and Conservative Clubs are gloomy, and all parties of Tories grumbling at each other.

(From the Standard of Friday.) Most gratifying is the assurance which we are able to offer to our friends, that notwithstanding those differences which rendered a dissolution of the Cabinet unavoidable, there is not the slightest danger of any schism in the great Conservative party, or of any desertion from it. The whole of the Cabinet retires without shade of personal hostility among its members, or any difference of sentiment upon the proper policy, except upon the one question of a repeal, or rather modification of the corn-laws. Upon this question, too, the difference is much less than has been supposed. It is, we believe, true that Sir Robert Peel has even insisted upon a considerable relaxation of the laws in question, to be accompanied, however, by a compensation to the agricultural interest—landowners, farmers, and farm

